



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

has survived the religious wars and the Treaty of Westphalia. The intolerance of Mr. Roosevelt for the opinions of the pacifists, his delight in calling them "cavens," "cowards," "poltroons," "destroyers," "eunuchs," etc., is in point. The intolerance of the pacifists for Mr. Roosevelt is none the less pertinent. Some of the adjectives applied to Mr. Roosevelt are that he is intemperate, intolerant, superficial, conventional, platitudeous, stupid, wicked, cheap, slap-you-in-the-face, bull-necked, swash-bucklin, hell-roaring, mailed fist, doltish. The point is that the intolerance is typical of all kinds of intolerance, whether it be from one side or the other, and intolerance is a fruitful source of differences, suspicions, fears, hatreds, and conflicts.

Another reason why men are willing to go to war is the absence of an adequate international organization which makes international law possible and effective. It is true that nations are, for the most part, unwilling to submit certain cases to any international organization now existing. It is also true that large numbers of men, and that among the leaders of men, see no sanction for international law other than force. When an issue is joined, they see no recourse other than arms.

It is not our purpose here to analyze these causes of war, nor to show the ways of overcoming them. We simply state them.

THE LETTERS FROM DR. ELIOT

IT IS comforting to us that Dr. Charles W. Eliot, with his rich experience, is applying his great mind so assiduously to the problem of how to overcome war. We long ago learned to listen to his words with respect. The world has profited greatly by his teachings, and it will profit by them increasingly.

His letters, which appear elsewhere in these columns, deserve an answer, if an answer is possible. We do not refer to the matters about which he and we agree, but to the issues about which we seem to disagree, at least about which there are differences of understanding.

It is evident that we have not succeeded in making clear that our "plan," "more feasible and more promising" to us than any other plan, is that there may be an extension of that rational international organization which has already been so hopefully begun. We refer, of course, to the court of arbitration provided for in 1899, a tribunal which has already demonstrated its practicability and its serviceability. We refer also to the Supreme Court of the World, which practically all of the nations of the world unanimously agreed to in principle in 1907.

Then, too, we have not made clear that our "plan" does provide for "a sanction for international law." From our point of view, the sanction upon which we

depend is the only hopeful sanction, because it is the only real and ultimate sanction. In 1625 Grotius based the sanction of international law, that is to say sovereignty, in nature. Puffendorf and Hobbes took the position that, since there is no compelling force behind international law, international law is therefore not binding. But Bynkershoek found the sanction of international law to lie in the common consent of men; that is to say, in humanity or public opinion.

The American Peace Society subscribes, with Elihu Root, James Brown Scott, and others, to this last interpretation. The sanction for international law, like the sovereignty of nations, lies in the very consent of the parties; that is to say, in public opinion which grows out of the customs, codes, decisions, treaties, awards, laws, and precedents of men in their associated capacities. To repeat, we place the ultimate sanction of international law not in force, but in public opinion.

Again, we should have made clearer that it is not our "policies" in Europe which have been "shown to be wholly futile." Our policies have unfortunately received very little attention from the powers now at war. The policy of the European nations has been more nearly the policy seemingly approved by Dr. Eliot, namely, that "There is no government and no court in the world which does not rest ultimately upon force." That is the only policy that has been effectively in operation in Europe, especially during the last forty years. It must be that policy, therefore, which has failed and brought on the present war. It is that policy, and that policy only, we believe, which has "postponed the coming of international peace." An interesting aspect of Dr. Eliot's position is that he himself seems really to disapprove of that bloody policy when he uses a bit contemptuously the words: "the violent proceedings of the international law-breaker who believes that in practice might makes right."

In short, we wish that Dr. Eliot, and those who believe with him, might heartily agree with us that the problem of "competitive national arming and the fighting sure to result therefrom" is to be solved only by a finer international organization in terms of international law backed, as it must be, by the sanction of public opinion. We wish that he and they would grant further that it is not our "methods or policies" that have been proved to be "unsound." Surely it is not the failure of our long-pursued policies that is "abject." The abject "failure" is to be found elsewhere. We are quite clearly of the opinion that it is to be found in the philosophy of Puffendorf, Hobbes, and Dr. Eliot that "there is no government and no court in the world which does not rest ultimately on force."

We may appropriately quote from the Prime Minister of England, who, speaking in Dublin in September,

1914, declared that one of the ends we must all keep in view is "the substitution for force, for the clash of competing ambition, for groupings and alliances and a precarious equipoise, of a real European partnership based on the recognition of equal right and established and enforced by a common will."

EDITORIAL NOTES

Universities and the War

At the recent opening of the Leeds University Medical School, England, Sir William Osler, Regius Professor of Medicine at Oxford, referred to the present war as "a periodic attack of acute mania on the part of the race." Sir William, not unknown to Americans, believes that the young men of England have been trained to regard warfare as one of the prerogatives of Jehovah. He said: "The pride, pomp, and circumstance of war have so captivated the human mind that its horrors are deliberately minimized. The soldier embodies the heroic virtues, and the camp is the nursery of fortitude and chivalry. The inspiration of the nation is its battles."

The explanation of this, he believes, lies in the fact that we are in the childhood of civilization, the lust of war is still in the blood. There seems to be no final appeal but to the ordeal of battle. "Some of us," he said, "had indulged the fond hope that in the power man had gained over nature had arisen possibilities for intellectual and social development such as to control collectively his morals and emotions, so that the nations would not learn war any more. We were foolish enough to think that where Christianity had failed science might succeed, forgetting that the hopelessness of the failure of the gospel lay not in the message, but in its interpretation. The promised peace was for the individual—the world was to have tribulations." He declared that organized knowledge must infiltrate every activity of human life. There is a difficulty in those islands which in fruitful ideas, inventions, and discoveries has had the lion's share, but failed to grasp immediately their practical importance. The leaders of intellectual and political thought were not awake when the dawn appeared. The oligarchy who ruled politically were ignorant; the hierarchy who ruled intellectually were hostile. In two ways science is the best friend war ever had: it has made slaughter possible on a scale undreamt of, and it has enormously increased man's capacity to maim and to disable his fellow-man. Sir William believes that in the present war at least five or six millions of men in the prime of life will be killed.

As against science's contribution to war, the distinguished physician believes that there is a great credit balance—the enormous number spared the misery of

sickness, unspeakable tortures saved by anaesthesia, the lessened time of convalescence, the whole organization of nursing.

Dr. M. E. Sadler, Vice-Chancellor of Leeds University, pointed out that the universities of Göttingen, Heidelberg, and Berlin have had a great deal to do with bringing on the war. He expressed the feeling also that British universities had neglected scientific interests and methods in the training of young men who had passed on to high positions in the civil service. He added: "If Oxford had cared more for the study of the humanities and dialectics, we might have had in our civil service and government men who were so alert to the real drift of things and so alive to the possibilities of the destructive power of science that they in trumpet tones might have aroused their countrymen and prevented this war."

Our personal opinion is that the failure of the universities is only one aspect of the more colossal failure of our total human collective effort to establish international machinery for the realization of simple justice.

The Program of the Peace Congress. We are glad to call attention to the program of the Fifth American Peace Congress recently held in San Francisco. It is printed, as it was actually passed by the Congress, elsewhere in these pages. It is not exactly the program we would have devised. It contains too many paragraphs. We do not believe that paragraph V is founded upon fact. We have little faith that the nations now at war would look with any favor upon any possible suggestions from neutrals looking toward the end of the war. We are of the opinion that paragraph VI presents a plan which is impracticable.

There are valuable features, however, which will help. It is true that the President of the United States is deserving of credit for keeping this country out of the war. "Costly preparation against hypothetical dangers" is a felicitous and illuminating phrase. It seems proper that the recipients of special privilege should be reminded of the proprieties relative to representation upon the committees of Congress. The indictment against war is pertinent and powerful. The program of the League to Enforce Peace, especially in section 3, has been greatly improved.

It was well to re-emphasize our hope in the Third Hague Conference. Pan-American co-operation in the Mexican situation is deservedly mentioned. The merging of the Monroe Doctrine in a League of Pan-American Peace is not so clear. The references to our immigration policy and to women, while important enough, seem in the light of our main problem relatively insignificant. The paragraph referring to universities and